

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 449

EA 010 266

AUTHOR Frick, Stephen; And Others
TITLE A Study of the Curricula of Representative Colorado Springs Area Schools, as Characterized by Course Change and Continuity, 1961-1976. Monograph Series in Long-Range Educational Planning Number One.
SPONS AGENCY Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 92p.; Pages 20-25 may be illegible due to small, light print of original document ; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Program); *Comparative Analysis; *Curriculum Development; Educational Planning; Educational Research; *Elective Courses; Questionnaires; *Secondary Education; Student Needs; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

In order to define long-term curriculum trends and to understand more fully the reasons for curriculum change and continuity, course lists for six Colorado Springs school districts were compared for the years 1961-62, 1970-71, and 1976-77. In addition, confidential questionnaires were distributed to 108 administrators and teachers in the six districts. Replies were received from 96 of these. Composite tables of the changes that have occurred since 1961-62 reveal course proliferation at both the junior high and high school levels. Nonacademic courses show a much greater percentage increase than do academic ones. This concrete information, coupled with the more subjective data received in response to the questionnaires, suggests that in most districts there is no central guiding principle or administrative mechanism to regulate effectively the addition of new courses in terms of the relationship that they bear to existing courses and, hence, to the districts' overall educational plan. Some guidelines are suggested for concerned teachers and administrators who may be interested in arresting the trend toward proliferation. (Author/MLP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED149449

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Monograph Series
in
Long-Range Educational Planning

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stephen Frick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM "

NUMBER ONE

A STUDY OF THE CURRICULA OF REPRESENTATIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS AREA SCHOOLS, AS CHARACTERIZED BY
COURSE CHANGE AND CONTINUITY, 1961-1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Stephen Frick, Ph.D., Project Supervisor &
Principal Author

Diana Allen, Researcher
Debra Spencer Markus, Researcher

This Study Is Funded by Phi Delta Kappa

Colorado Springs

May 1977

EA 010 266

This study is the first in the monograph series: Tools for Long-Range Educational Planning in the Pikes Peak Area. The series was conceived by the research committee of the Colorado Springs chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, a national educational fraternity. This first monograph on curriculum has been funded by a grant from the national office of Phi Delta Kappa and to them we express our appreciation for their support.

We hope that the educational community in the Pikes Peak region--and educators across the country--will find this and the subsequent monographs useful in stimulating dialogue on long-range educational planning.

A. Donn Kesselheim, Ed.D.
Paul J. Kuerbis, Ph.D.

Series Co-Directors

This report has been prepared by:

Stephen Frick, Project Supervisor and Principal Author:
Ph.D. in history and literature, Cornell University; professional background in secondary teaching and college teaching and administration; areas of specialization: history, literature, peace and conflict studies, outdoor education.

Diana Allen, Researcher: B.A. in liberal arts (English), University of Portland; currently graduate student in Education, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; areas of specialization: secondary curriculum, computer programming.

Debra Spencer Markus, Researcher: B.A. in elementary education (art), University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; currently graduate student in Education, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs; areas of specialization: elementary education, environmental education.

Ms. Allen and Ms. Markus were largely concerned with interviewing teachers and administrators and collecting data and Dr. Frick's responsibilities lay in supervising and coordinating research, collating and standardizing the data and writing the report. Although this study contains substantive contributions from each of us, final responsibility for the report rests with Dr. Frick.

Many people have helped us at various stages: principals and teachers, superintendents, secretaries and curriculum supervisors, at the elementary, secondary and university levels. To all of them, our warmest thanks.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	COURSES ADDED AND DROPPED, 1961-1976	13
III.	RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES	27
IV.	CONCLUSION	48

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This study has a twofold purpose:

- i. To define long-term curriculum trends in grades K-12 within a selected, representative group of public schools in the Colorado Springs area.
- ii. To understand more fully the reasons for curriculum change and continuity.

2. In order to understand the significance of this study, what it does and does not attempt to accomplish, we must be clear about our definitions. Specifically with regard to the word "curriculum," we have discovered in our contacts with local educators that the word has at least two important meanings. This first concerns intra-disciplinary development, as in the radical shift in the vocabulary of mathematics since the introduction of "new math," or the revolution in the teaching of high school biology. It would generally be agreed that these important changes are essentially "curricular," in the sense that since their introduction the curriculum in their respective disciplines is significantly different. Although this definition of the term is not the one we have adopted for purposes of this report, we recommend that, as a logical follow-up to our own more broadly based study, there be a series of more specialized studies aimed at tracing the development of intra-disciplinary change within the more significant subject areas.

The more traditional definition of "curriculum," and the one that we have adopted in this report, concerns the relative proportion of the various disciplines within the

formal educational program offered to students. That is to say, it focuses upon the balance that exists among the subjects available to students. For this study, then, the following definition will hold:

Curriculum: the academic and non-academic subjects available to a student during his/her school career, as distinct from the content of any particular subject or the perspective of any individual teacher.

One of our primary assumptions has been that the disciplines (witness mathematics and biology) have seldom been static and will in all probability continue to evolve, at times radically. However, a very long view may bear out the hypothesis that a change in the balance that exists among the disciplines is at least as significant as those changes that occur within the disciplines themselves. Ultimately, this balance will have not only educational, but also social repercussions. A curriculum that is, for example, heavily weighted toward the social sciences will tend to produce students who think in social science categories, as contrasted with humanistic ones.

3. We examined curriculum shifts in four broad areas:

- i. Between academic and non-academic subjects
- ii. Within those disciplines defined as academic, between theoretical and practical subjects
- iii. Again within the academic disciplines, among the three large traditional disciplinary groupings: humanities, sciences and math, and social sciences
- iv. Finally, within non-academic subjects, among those defined as artistic, vocational/practical and self-exploratory

Further Definitions

Academic subjects: those disciplinarily based subjects, both theoretical and practical, of which the traditional liberal arts curriculum is comprised. Biology, literature and geometry are academic, driver education is not. Music theory and art appreciation are academic, chorus and crafts are not. Business math is academic, book-keeping is not, etc. We understand that it is virtually impossible to construct a binary list that would be totally acceptable to all educators and our distinctions may appear arbitrary in spots. Nevertheless, we urge that the reader accept a certain amount of definitional ambiguity in order that we may arrive at important general conclusions.

Discipline: a systematic approach to an aspect of reality, with traditions and methods generally agreed upon by its practitioners. Most of the subjects taught in the schools are disciplinary: math, language, science, history, and so forth. Some are not: "Interpersonal Relationships" and "College Survival," taught in District 11 and Harrison's "People Puzzles" are examples. The latter, although they make use of disciplinary materials at times, are concerned to explore not a traditional body of theory, but rather the individual student's personal experience of the world and the nature of his/her interaction with others. Until the present time, rational knowledge has advanced through the medium of the disciplines. However, this ought not to be taken as a denigration of certain non-disciplinary modes of thought which have, in their way, contributed to the general advancement of human consciousness. (In this study we have defined courses which proceed in this latter fashion as "self-exploratory.")

Theoretical: when applied to a discipline, one that is speculative and largely unconcerned with applications.

Practical: conversely, the aspects of a discipline that are concerned with its mechanics or with the solution of a specific problem, often one connected with a profession or trade. For example, geometry and trigonometry are theoretical, drafting and surveying are practical; foreign language instruction largely concerned with grammar is practical, with literature, theoretical.

Humanities: those academic disciplines concerned primarily with human values and experience, for example literature, philosophy, religion and, until recently, history. In contrast with the social sciences, a cardinal assumption of the humanities is that certain deep aspects of human behavior are ineffable, inaccessible to "proof" and verifiable only through experience.

Sciences: those academic disciplines primarily concerned with the external world, which progress through the systematization of empirically observed data. Examples: physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy. We classify Mathematics with the sciences because, although its methods bear a strong resemblance to certain of the humanities, its ends are not concerned with human values, but are neutral.

Social Sciences: those academic disciplines largely born in the 19th century, whose ends are in some ways humanistic, but whose methods are scientific (e.g. sociology, psychology). Intent upon applying scientific method to human behavior, the primary goal of the social sciences is the quantification of human experience. History is now widely considered to be a social science. Note:

Within elementary and secondary schools the term social studies is generally used. However, since there is disciplinary continuity between an elementary school civics course and a graduate course in political science, we have adopted the more inclusive, generic term "social science."

The non-academic categories are:

Artistic: courses that are concerned with the application of aesthetic principles. Studio drawing and instrumental music are classified here, although art and music appreciation would be listed as humanities.

Vocational/practical: courses such as auto mechanics, woodworking, shorthand, typing and driver education. We have included physical education in this category.

Self-exploratory: as mentioned above, a new breed of non-disciplinary courses whose focus is individual self-awareness using, as a point of departure, not a traditional body of knowledge, but the student's own experience.

4. Method of approach. Following the dictum that one cannot understand the present without considering the past, this study is strongly historical. It is also, given the limitations of personnel, time and money, highly selective. This is to say that we have chosen to consider the curricula of certain selected Colorado Springs area public schools at certain times in the past fifteen years. To be specific:

- i. The years chosen are a) 1961-62, b) 1970-71 and c) the present academic year, 1976-77. The first year was chosen because it reflected curricula during the early post-sputnik days.

Also, it is sufficiently remote from the present that, in a substantial number of cases, there has developed since then a new generation of teachers and administrators in the chosen schools and we felt it worthwhile to ascertain their understanding of the past. The year 1970-71 is interesting because it represents the culmination of much of the educational ferment (or disorder, depending upon one's point of view) of the 60's. Finally, we finish with the current school year in order to give the study as much relevance as possible for those teaching today.

- ii. Selecting representative schools within appropriate school districts presented no major problems once we accepted the fact that there is no such thing as a truly representative school. Each has its unique qualities which its own faculty and administration will be quick to point out. However, in the matter of curriculum there exists among area public schools more that is similar than dissimilar. Therefore, with the help of a number of area educators, we have put together the following list of school districts, which furnished us with the data upon which this study is based. In our opinion these schools represent the same mixture of constituencies that is to be found in the wider Colorado Springs community.

- a. Air Academy (District 20)
- b. Cheyenne Mountain (District 12)
- c. Colorado Springs District 11
- d. Falcon (District 49)
- e. Harrison (District 2)
- f. Manitou Springs (District 14)

The student population of these school districts is defined in the following manner (as reported by the districts themselves):

a. Air Academy (District 20)

4,667 students (K-12)

Almost exclusively white (less than 5% black, chicano)

All income ranges, plurality in upper-middle range

Suburban/rural

Children of military families: 30%

Approx. 63% of graduating seniors enter higher education

b. Cheyenne Mountain (District 12)

1,975 students

Almost exclusively white (only 6 black children in district, very few chicanos)

Middle to upper-middle to very wealthy income ranges

Suburban

Children of military families: 6% (mostly officer rank)

Approx. 85% of graduating seniors enter higher education (the highest proportion in the study)

c. Colorado Springs District 11

34,423 students (3rd largest district in Colorado)

84% white, 9% chicano, 6% black, 1% other

All income ranges

Urban/suburban

Children of military families: 33%

Approx. 55% graduating seniors enter higher education

- d. Falcon (District 49)
1,022 students
Almost exclusively white (about 3% black,
2% chicano)
Upper-lower to middle income ranges pre-ponderant
Suburban/rural (most rural dwellers commute to work in city)
Children of military families: 25%
Approx. 30% of graduating seniors enter higher education (the lowest proportion in the study)
- e. Harrison (District 2)
7,023 students
73% white, 13% black, 13% chicano, 1% other
(the district with the greatest racial mix in the study)
All income ranges, but heavier at the poverty level than any other district
Urban/suburban
Children of military families: 40%, mostly enlisted ranks (the highest proportion in this study)
Approx. 46% of graduating seniors enter higher education
- f. Manitou Springs (District 14)
1,200 students
Largely white (6 black and 60 chicano students)
All income ranges, but largely lower-middle to middle
Urban/suburban
Very few children of military
Approx. 40% of graduating seniors enter higher education

5. The next step involved acquiring course lists for each of these districts for all of the target years. We arranged the lists according to these categories:

Academic/Non-Academic

Theoretical/Practical

Humanities/Sciences & Math/Social Sciences

Artistic/Vocational & Practical/Self-Exploratory

We then made composite tables, noting what changes had occurred since 1961-62. This constitutes Part II of the study.

6. After studying the course collations, we constructed questionnaires which sought to clarify and to give substance to the raw data of the course lists. We decided that our purposes would be better served by administering a subjective questionnaire, which required somewhat discursive responses, to relatively few people, than by distributing a series of easily quantifiable questions to a larger number of respondents. In short, we decided for depth rather than breadth of response, accepting the critical and editorial obligations inherent in our choice. It is our (no doubt debatable) conviction, that we have thereby gained more meaningful information than would have been the case if we had proceeded otherwise.

We distributed 108 confidential questionnaires to administrators and teachers in the six districts. There were 96 replies from teachers with varying degrees of experience, from principals, superintendents and curriculum supervisors. A breakdown of the replies is given in Section III.

Our criteria for administering the questionnaire were varied. We tried to select some teachers who offered traditional courses and some who offered new additions to the curriculum. We picked new teachers as well as many

who had been teaching in the system for many years, even though the newer teachers would not have been involved in the earlier curricula. (We felt that it would be interesting to discover what sort of awareness of curricular tradition the newer teacher might have.) In all cases we selected our teacher respondents because they taught courses which we felt, as a result of scanning the course collations, should be represented. Let it be said directly that this study does not attempt to achieve statistical validity. Rather it bases its credibility on the thoughtful responses of a carefully selected group of teachers and administrators.

7. The following data were sought, in order to identify the nature of the respondent while insuring the confidentiality of his/her replies:

- i. Subject taught
- ii. Grade level
- iii. School district
- iv. Number of years in district

We, ourselves, know the identities of our respondents, but unless a given respondent chooses otherwise this information will not be shared.

8. The following questions were asked of each respondent:

- i. Ideally, what influences do you think should be paramount in determining whether to add, drop, or retain a course in the curriculum?
- ii. Realistically, what influences do you think are paramount in making these determinations?
- iii. Ideally, which individuals within the school system should bear primary responsibility for adding, dropping, or retaining courses in the curriculum?
- iv. Realistically, who in fact makes these decisions?

- v. Do you feel that over the past 15 years the number of new courses added to and old courses dropped from the curriculum is (circle one):
- Far too great
 - Rather too great
 - About right
 - Not quite enough
 - Not nearly enough
- vi. Do you feel that the nature of these additions and deletions over the past 15 years has been (circle one):
- Far too conservative
 - Rather too conservative
 - About right
 - Rather too radical
 - Far too radical
- vii. Taking into account what has transpired during the past 15 years, what general trends in course change do you favor?
- viii. What general trends do you deplore?
- ix. Specifically, what courses do you feel should not have been added to the curriculum?
- x. What courses do you feel should not have been dropped from the curriculum?
- xi. On the other hand, what courses do you feel ought to have been added to the curriculum, and weren't?
- xii. And which ones ought to have been dropped, and weren't?
- xiii. If the decision were entirely up to you, on what basis would you decide whether to admit a new course to the curriculum? (For example, suppose that a group of parents and students proposed a course in yoga?)

- xiv. Conversely, if the decision were up to you and you alone, on what basis would you make your judgment if a similar group of parents and students suggested dropping a time-honored course such as literature?
- xv. Finally, how would you explain the fact that so many courses in the curriculum seem to have earned a permanent place there, with their right to be taught scarcely ever (if indeed ever at all) challenged? (Consider that many of the subjects in our various curricula have been there since the days of classical Greece, that is to say for over 2,000 years.)

9. Upon the return of the questionnaires, the results were summarized in Part III.

10. We drew our conclusions and made recommendations, which are presented in Part IV.

11. What we present here is an overview of curriculum change, stressing general trends and extracting general principles. We feel that the methods used in the study, the questions asked and the conclusions drawn, are exportable to other school districts in Colorado and across the country.

II. COURSES ADDED AND DROPPED, 1961-1976

1. The following tables are in two parts.

i. The first six tables indicate the actual number of courses added and dropped from 1961 (or whatever base year is indicated) to the present, in a selected sample of schools within the six districts chosen for the study. An example, based on the table for School District "C," High School #1, will illustrate the manner in which the tables are to be read:

Humanities
Theoretical
61 70 76 ±

20 39 42 +22

This indicates that within this category, in this particular school, 20 courses were offered in 1961-62, 39 in 1970-71, and 42 in 1976-77, with a net gain of 22 courses. Should the base year for some reason be later than 1961 (data not available or school not then in existence) that information will be given in parentheses: (64), (72), etc.

ii. The remaining four tables indicate percentage of courses added and dropped within a category. For example, "+200%" means that courses in that category, in that school, have trebled since the base year. Although these changes may be very significant in terms of the direction a particular school is taking, the actual number of courses represented by the percentage change may either be large or small. That is to say that a "+200%" may mean that in the base year 2 courses were offered, compared with 6 in 1976, or it may mean that 20 courses were offered in the base year and 60 in 1976. These tables should be studied in conjunction with the previous six.

2. When we speak of "courses," we mean discrete topics of study, not sections of one course. For example, "The Short Story," "Mythology," and "Modern American Literature" are counted as separate courses, whereas a multiple-section course in "World Literature" would count as only one course.

3. In some cases junior high comprises grades 7 & 8, in others 7, 8 & 9. Also, in some instances the grades considered as part of "junior high" for purposes of this study were not, during the earlier years, so named by their own district. Where this is the case, it has been so noted in the tables.

4. The tables are intended to represent general phenomena and are not meant to be detailed analyses of individual schools. For this reason, we have not identified the schools which we use as models. It is our conviction that our findings are applicable to most schools in the Pikes Peak region, if not across the country, but readers must decide for themselves how congruent these findings are with the specific educational settings within which they themselves operate.

5. All data in these tables have been checked with school administrators. In some cases, the records of district administrators and of school principals are at variance. The figures given represent our best understanding of the actual number of courses offered.

6. SPECIAL NOTE CONCERNING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. The elementary school curricula in all of the districts studied are extremely stable and in no case did the net difference in courses added and subtracted between 1961 and 1976 amount to more than 2. (Contrast this with a net addition of 184 courses for one high school.) Given the stability of these elementary curricula there is little point in furnishing tables for grades K-6, and they have therefore not been included. However, there is every indication that intra-disciplinary change of great magnitude has taken place in the elementary schools and that even though there would be little point in applying to the elementary schools the definition of "curriculum" adopted for this report, it would nevertheless be most rewarding to study that aspect of elementary curriculum that would be defined as "change within a discipline." Such a study would be a logical addition to this Monograph Series.

COMMENTS CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING 10 TABLES APPEAR ON PP. 25 & 26.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "A"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Practical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 ±	Artistic 61 70 76 ±	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 ±	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 ±	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 ±	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 ±	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 ±	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 ±
JUNIOR HIGH	(72) 26 17 -9	(72) 25 17 -8	(72) 18 19 +1	(72) 0 0 0	(72) 7 4 -3	(72) 0 0 0	(72) 18 41 +3	(72) 32 39 +7	(72) 0 0 0	(72) 51 34 -17	18 19 +1	7 4 -3	76 57 -19	70 82 +12	146 139 -7
HIGH SCHOOL	20 41 +21	15 23 +8	17 53 +36	0 3 +3	14 32 +18	0 0 0	13 24 +11	32 95 +63	0 3 +3	35 64 +29	17 36 +19	14 32 +18	66 152 +86	45 122 +77	111 274 +163

NOTE: 1. Junior high: no data available before 1972.
 2. Senior high: no data available for 1961-62.
 3. Junior high includes grades 7, 8 & 9.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "B"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences * Math Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences * Math Practical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 ±	Artistic 61 70 76 ±	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 ±	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 ±	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 ±	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 ±	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 ±	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 ±
JUNIOR HIGH	2 5 4*2	0 12 10*10	5 7 8*3	0 0 0 0	2 9 11*9	0 0 0 0	6 7 11*5	6 12 12*6	0 0 0 0	2 17 19*17	5 7 8*3	2- 9 11*9	9 33 38*29	12 19 23*11	21 52 61*40
HIGH SCHOOL	17 23 22*3	6 8 8*2	12 15 16*4	0 0 2*2	5 6 5*2	0 2 2*2	4 7 12*8	5 10 10*5	0 0 0 0	23 29 30*7	12 15 18*6	5 8 9*4	40 52 57*17	9 17 22*13	49 69 79*30

NOTE: 1. 9th grade included in high school, 1961-62.
2. 9th grade included in junior high, 1970-71 & 1976-77.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "C"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Practical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 ±	Artistic 61 70 76 ±	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 ±	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 ±	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 ±	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 ±	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 ±	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 ±
JUNIOR HIGH #1	4 5 7+3	1 1 7+6	7 9 12+5	0 0 1+1	3 3 3 0	0 0 0 0	3 3 8+3	12 10 9+3	0 0 0 0	5 6 14+9	7 9 13+6	3 3 3 0	15 18 30+15	17 15 17 0	32 33 47+17
JUNIOR HIGH #2	(64) 4 4 5+1	(64) 2 1 6+6	(64) 7 8 15+6	(64) 0 0 1+1	(64) 3 3 3 0	(64) 0 0 0 0	(64) 3 3 20+17	(64) 11 10 17+6	(64) 0 1 0 0	(64) 6 7 11+5	(64) 7 8 16+9	(64) 3 3 3 0	(64) 16 18 30+14	(64) 14 14 37+23	(64) 30 32 67+37
HIGH SCHOOL #1	20 39 42+22	18 23 41+23	22 50 60+38	10 3 12+2	11 10 37+26	3 4 4+1	22 16 32+10	71 56 128+57	0 0 5+5	38 62 83+45	32 53 72+48	14 14 41+27	81 124 196+112	93 72 165+472	177 201 361+1064
HIGH SCHOOL #2	46	24	42	7	29	2	25	73	2	80	49	11	160	100	260

NOTE: 1. Junior Highs include grades 7, 8 & 9.
 2. Junior High #2 established in 1964.
 3. High School #2 established in 1975; included here for comparison with older high school. The older school offers 100 more courses than the newer one, which may indicate that course proliferation is an intra-school phenomenon, part of a natural aging process. It may be instructive to see if the apparently inevitable proliferation occurs at #2.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "D"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Practical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 ±	Artistic 61 70 76 ±	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 ±	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 ±	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 ±	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 ±	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 ±	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 ±
GRADES 7 & 8	2 8 +6	0 0 0	2 8 +6	0 0 0	2 4 +2	0 0 0	2 6 +4	6 6 0	0 0 0	2 8 +6	2 8 +6	2 4 +2	6 20 +14	8 12 +4	14 32 +18
HIGH SCHOOL	4 3 +1	0 8 +8	4 8 +5	0 1 +1	2 3 +3	0 0 0	0 6 +6	5 20 +15	0 0 0	4 13 +9	4 11 +7	2 5 +3	10 29 +19	5 26 +21	15 55 +40

NOTE: 1. No data available for this district for 1961-62.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "E"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 *	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 *	Sciences + Math Theoretical 61 70 76 *	Sciences + Math Practical 61 70 76 *	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 *	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 *	Artistic 61 70 76 *	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 *	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 *	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 *	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 *	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 *	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 *	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 *	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 *
JUNIOR HIGH	4 5 9+5	1 4 3+2	2 16 12+5	2 3 0-1	4 3 8+4	0 0 4+4	7 4 11+4	9 9 8-1	0 0 2+2	5 9 12+7	8 19 12+4	4 3 12+8	17 31 36+19	16 13 21+5	33 44 57+2
HIGH SCHOOL	8 9 21+13	6 9 22+16	11 10 18+7	2 2 3+3	4 7 19+15	0 1 1+1	5 9 22+17	22 20 36+34	0 1 2+2	14 18 43+29	13 12 23+10	4 8 20+16	31 38 86+55	27 30 80+53	58 68 166+106

NOTE: 1. Junior High includes grades 7, 8 & 9.

SCHOOL DISTRICT "B"

	Humanities Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Humanities Practical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Sciences + Math Practical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Theoretical 61 70 76 ±	Social Sciences Practical 61 70 76 ±	Artistic 61 70 76 ±	Vocational Practical 61 70 76 ±	Self- Exploratory 61 70 76 ±	HUMANITIES 61 70 76 ±	SCIENCES + MATH 61 70 76 ±	SOCIAL SCIENCES 61 70 76 ±	ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	NON- ACADEMIC 61 70 76 ±	ALL COURSES 61 70 76 ±
GRADES 7 & 8	4 2-4 7	2 0 2 0	4 2 10+6	0 0 0 0	4 0 2-2	0 0 0 0	4 6 6+2	2 3 10+8	0 0 1+1	6 2 6 0	4 2 10+6	4 0 2-2	14 4 18+4	6 9 17+11	20 13 35+13
HIGH SCHOOL	5 9 14+9	7 8 8+1	10 11 11+1	0 1 1+1	5 11 12+7	0 1 1+1	3 7 7+4	13 17 18+5	0 0 0 0	12 17 22+10	10 12 12+2	5 12 13+8	27 41 47+20	16 24 25+9	43 65 72+29

NOTE: 1. High School includes grades 9, 10, 11 & 12.

JUNIOR HIGHS: %AGE CHANGES IN SUBJECT AREAS, BASE YEAR - 1976¹

District	Humanities Theoretical	Humanities Practical	Sciences & Math Theoretical	Sciences & Math Practical	Social Sciences Theoretical	Social Sciences Practical	Artistic	Vocational Practical	Self- Exploratory
A (7,8&9)	-35%	-32%	+6%	0	-43%	0	+13%	+22%	0
C#1 (7,8&9)	+75%	+600%	+71%	+100%	0	0	+60%	-25%	0
C#2 (7,8&9)	+25%	+200%	+114%	+100%	0	0	+567%	+55%	0
D (7&8)	+300%	0	+300%	0	+100%	0	+200%	0	0
E (7,8&9)	+125%	+200%	+71%	-100%	+100%	+400%	+57%	-11%	+200%
F (7&8)	0	0	+150%	0	-50%	0	+50%	+400%	+100%
Average %age Change	+82%	+161%	+119%	+17%	+18%	+67%	+158%	+74%	+50%

- Note: 1. Base year for District "A": 1972; District "C#2": 1964; District "D": 1970; all others: 1961.
 2. District "B" not included. 9th grade moved from high school to junior high after 1961, data not separable for comparison with other districts.
 3. Certain "Average percentage changes" are not very significant statistically--e.g. Social Sciences Practical and Self-Exploratory, weighted as they are toward one or two districts.

JUNIOR HIGHS: CUMULATIVE %AGE CHANGES, BASE YEAR - 1976¹

	HUMANITIES	SCIENCES & MATH	SOCIAL SCIENCES	TOTAL: ACADEMIC	TOTAL: NON- ACADEMIC	GRAND TOTAL: ALL COURSES
<u>District</u>						
A (7,8&9)	-33%	+6%	-43%	-25%	+17%	-5%
C#1 (7,8&9)	+180%	+86%	0	+100%	0	+47%
C#2 (7,8&9)	+83%	+129%	0	+88%	+164%	+123%
D (7&8)	+300%	+300%	+100%	+233%	+50%	+129%
E (7,8&9)	+140%	+50%	+200%	+112%	+31%	+73%
F (7&8)	0	+150%	-50%	+29%	+183%	+75%
Average %age Change	+112%	+120%	+35%	+90%	+74%	+74%

- Note: 1. Base year for District "A": 1972; District "C#2": 1964; District "D": 1970; all others: 1961
 2. District "B" not included. 9th grade moved from high school to junior high after 1961, data not separable for comparison with other districts.

HIGH SCHOOLS: %AGE CHANGES IN SUBJECT AREAS, BASE YEAR - 1976¹

District	Humanities Theoretical	Humanities Practical	Sciences & Math Theoretical	Sciences & Math Practical	Social Sciences Theoretical	Social Sciences Practical	Artistic	Vocational Practical	Self- Exploratory
A (10,11&12)	+105%	+53%	+212%	+300%	+129%	0	+85%	+197%	+300%
C#1 (10,11&12)	+110%	+128%	+173%	+20%	+236%	+33%	+45%	+80%	+500%
D (9,10,11& 12)	+25%	+800%	+125%	+200%	+150%	0	+600%	+300%	0
E (10,11&12)	+163%	+267%	+64%	+150%	+375%	+100%	+340%	+155%	+200%
F (9,10,11& 12)	+140%	+14%	+10%	+100%	+140%	+100%	+133%	+38%	0
Average %age Change	+109%	+252%	+117%	+154%	+206%	+47%	+241%	+154%	+200%

- Note: 1. Base year for District "A": 1970; District "D": 1970, all others: 1961.
 2. District "B" not included. 9th grade moved from high school to junior high after 1961, data not separable for comparison with other districts.

HIGH SCHOOLS: CUMULATIVE %AGE CHANGES, BASE YEAR - 1976¹

	HUMANITIES	SCIENCE & MATH	SOCIAL - SCIENCES	TOTAL: ACADEMIC	TOTAL: NON- ACADEMIC	GRAND TOTAL: ALL COURSES
<u>District</u>						
A (10,11&12)	+82%	+230%	+128%	+130%	+171%	+146%
C#1 (10,11&12)	+118%	+125%	+193%	+133%	+77%	+104%
D (9,10,11& 12)	+225%	+175%	+150%	+190%	+420%	+267%
E (10,11&12)	+207%	+77%	+400%	+177%	+196%	+186%
F (9,10,11& 12)	+83%	+20%	+160%	+74%	+56%	+67%
Average %age Change	+143%	+125%	+206%	+141%	+184%	+154%

- Note: 1. Base year for District "A": 1970; District "D": 1970; all others: 1961.
 2. District "B" not included. 9th grade moved from high school to junior high after 1961, data not separable for comparison with other districts.

COMMENTS

Before proceeding to an analysis of the course tables themselves, two significant findings which were the result of the information gathering process need to be recorded.

1. In all cases but one, it was apparent that information concerning course change and continuity was not readily available. Most of the administrators whom we contacted had difficulty in laying hands upon the material which we requested, indicating to us that knowledge of the balance that exists between the various types of courses is not a primary concern to those making curricular decisions. If it were, then the sort of information presented here--the result of a great deal of inquiry on our part--would be at the fingertips of appropriate administrators.

2. In most school districts there were discrepancies between the 1977 courses listed by central administration and those actually offered in the schools. In some cases, central administration listed courses that were not actually taught, while in others they failed to list courses that were being offered. We do not intend to single out individual districts as examples, but those who are responsible for the flow of information between administration and the schools within their district should note that in some cases these discrepancies totalled between 30 and 60 courses.

As far as the courses themselves are concerned, the following points are interesting:

JUNIOR HIGH

1. Subject areas that show the most striking growth are:

- a. Humanities Practical (caused by a large increase in basic language instruction and such courses as Business English)
- b. Artistic
- c. Sciences & Math Theoretical

2. Overall trends:

- a. Sciences & Math offerings have increased at a faster rate than other academic areas with Humanities close behind. Social Sciences lag far behind on the average, although they have increased substantially in two schools.
- b. Both academic and non-academic offerings have grown substantially, with academic courses leading.

HIGH SCHOOL

1. Subject areas that have grown most dramatically:
 - a. Humanities Practical
 - b. Artistic
 - c. Social Sciences Theoretical
 - d. Self-Exploratory (few actual courses, but an interesting new phenomenon)
2. Overall trends:
 - a. When all courses are counted (as distinct from considering percentage averages), Social Sciences show more growth than Sciences or Humanities.
 - b. Non-Academic courses have outstripped academic ones by a substantial margin, not in terms of overall numbers, but proportionally.

BOTH LEVELS

Even a cursory inspection of the tables will reveal one unambiguous phenomenon at both the junior high and high school levels: course proliferation. As true as this is at the junior high level, it is doubly true in the high schools, where the sheer number of courses added since the base year is in some cases overwhelming (e.g. "A" high school: +163; "C#1" high school: +184; "E" high school: +108).

This concrete information, coupled with the more subjective data received in response to the questionnaires, suggests that in most districts there is no central guiding principle or administrative mechanism to regulate effectively the addition of new courses in terms of the relationship that they bear to existing courses and, hence, to the districts' overall educational plan.

It has been suggested that increase in the number of courses is related to the growth of the school population. There is no logical reason that this should be so. Rather, there is a great deal of subjective evidence that much of the impetus for adding courses comes from teachers who want to develop interests of their own and from special interest groups in the community, with constraints being imposed primarily by the budget and not by long range educational policy. (See Questionnaire, ii)

III. RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES

1. We distributed 108 questionnaires and received back 96. The data presented in the following pages represent the responses of:

15	Teachers (1-3 years in district)
20	Teachers (4-6 years in district)
32	Teachers (7+ years in district)
5	Superintendents/Assistant Superintendents
10	Curriculum Supervisors, District 11
<u>14</u>	Principals
96	TOTAL

2. Among the teachers, the main factor determining differences of opinion was number of years in the district, not, interestingly, subject or grade taught. This explains the breakdown we have used in the tables which follow.

3. We have presented the data graphically rather than numerically (~~1111~~ 1 = 6), so that patterns of response will be more easily spotted. We also indicate the total number of similar responses, and the number of respondents within a particular category. For example:

years in district (teachers)	
RESPONSE	1-3 — (15) — # of respondents, this category
Student needs	(50) ~~1111~~ 11
Total: all respondents	Total: this category

4. In many cases, individual respondents listed more than one factor in response to a question.

5. These responses represent the beliefs of those whom we sampled. In any specific instance relating to a particular curricular decision in a particular school, these beliefs may or may not be congruent with reality. The reader must decide whether, in his or her experience, the responses given by our sampling of teachers and administrators are transferrable to the reader's professional context. (It is our own conviction that the information contained in these questionnaires has validity beyond the particular schools used in the study.)

COMMENTS ON THE RESPONSES IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW EACH CHART

- i. Ideally, what influences do you think should be paramount in determining whether to add, drop, or retain a course in the curriculum?

		TEACHERS					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
Student needs (not defined)	(50)	1111 11	1111 11	1111 1111 11	1111	1111 111	1111 1111 1
Community/Societal needs	(30)	1111 1	1111	1111 11	1	1111	1111 1
Student needs after graduation	(28)	111	1111 11	1111 1111 1111	1		11
Student interest/demand	(26)	1	1111 1111 1	1111 111	1	1	1111
Overall student development	(15)	11	1111	1111 111	1		
Teacher interest/availability	(13)		111	1111			1111
Part of well-rounded program	(8)	1	1	1111			1
Budget	(6)		11	11			11
Reflective of long-term policy	(5)		1	1111			

Other: Adequate facilities (3), scheduling practicality (2), aimed at "future world" (2), enduring value (1), recommendations of professionals (1), school board philosophy (1), college expectation (1).

COMMENTS

- i. The problem here--it recurred throughout the study--is, how does one define a "need"? In some cases the respondents were specific, particularly with reference to job needs after graduation. More often, however, the word "need" was used as a kind of totem, self-explaining and self-justifying; often the word "need" was confused with "desire."

It is significant that:

1. The more experienced teachers and the school principals made the most varied responses to the question.
2. The superintendents, supervisors and newer teachers tended to stress undefined "needs."
3. Budget is given a very low place here. (Compare with Question ii.)
4. Teacher interest/availability is ranked low. (Compare with Question ii.)

Further study: Attempt to have respondents define, in some detail, what they mean by "student needs," although the vagueness of many of the present responses suggests that it might be difficult for many of them to do so.

ii. Realistically, what influences do you think are paramount in making these determinations?

		TEACHERS						Superintendents	Supervisors	Principals
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	(5)		(10)		(14)	
Teacher interest/ availability	(37)	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	111		1111		~~1111~~	
Budget	(28)	1111	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ 1111	1		11		~~1111~~	
Parent/community interest/pressure	(24)	1111	~~1111~~	~~1111~~ 111	111		11		11	
Student needs (not defined)	(20)	1	111	~~1111~~ 1	111		11		~~1111~~	
Student interest	(20)	111	~~1111~~ 1	1111	1		111		111	
Administrator interest	(18)	11	111	~~1111~~ 11	1		1111		1	
School board interest	(10)	1	111	111	1				11	
Scheduling practicality	(9)		11	11	1				1111	
Adequate facilities	(8)	1	1	11					1111	
Tradition	(7)	1	1	1	11		11			
Student vocational needs	(7)		1111	11					1	
Preparation for further education	(6)		1	1111					1	
Vocal minority pressure	(5)	1	1	1	11					

Other: Balanced curriculum (1), Recommendation by professionals (2), standardized test pressure (1) legislative pressure (2), textbook availability (3), wishes of new teachers (2), counselor support (1), supports basic program (3).

COMMENTS

- ii. 1. Teacher interest is given highest rank. Respondents noted (in some cases with a tinge of sarcasm) that courses were often offered because a particular teacher wanted to indulge a kind of intellectual hobby.
2. Budget was ranked quite high, not, interestingly, by the superintendents, but by the teachers, who have little say concerning district budgets. Are teachers suspicious of that over which they have no control? Are superintendents playing down the importance of money?
3. Taken all together, practical considerations far outweigh those that might be defined as "learning-for-the-sake-of-learning."

Further study: Consider a number of specific decisions and attempt to analyze the importance of each of the factors present. If we are indeed making curricular choices based primarily on teacher interest and money, it is important that this be recognized.

- iii. Ideally, which individuals within the school system should bear primary responsibility for adding, dropping, or retaining courses in the curriculum?

TEACHERS

RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
Teachers	(67)	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1111	111	111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 111
Administrators (not defined)	(35)	~~1111~~ 111	1111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 11	11	11	~~1111~~ 11
Principals	(24)	1	111	~~1111~~ 111	111	111	~~1111~~ 1
Students	(23)	1111	~~1111~~ 111	~~1111~~ 1			~~1111~~
Parents	(20)	1	~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ 11		1	~~1111~~
Curriculum directors	(19)		111	~~1111~~ 11	1	111	~~1111~~
Counselors	(14)	1111	1111	1111			11
Department heads	(14)	1	11	~~1111~~	1	11	111
School board	(7)		1111	11			1
Undefined committees	(5)			11		111	

Other: Superintendents (2), concerned lay people (1), curriculum supervisors, District 11 (3).

COMMENTS

- iii. 1. The greatest single category here is "teacher," yet if the various classes of administrators (principals, curriculum director, etc.) are added to the undefined "administrator" category, that group would outweigh the teachers.
2. Problem: Teachers are disciplinary specialists. If they make curricular decisions they will, presumably, act for the benefit of their own discipline. Are teachers qualified to determine how a course which they want very much to add to the curriculum will affect the overall balance that should exist among the disciplines? On the other hand, aren't most administrators drawn from the pool of teachers? Who has the proper perspective--and training--to make the necessary determinations to preserve a coherent, balanced curriculum?

Further study: Define a set of qualities desirable in those whose responsibility it is to admit certain courses to and (in rare cases) drop courses from the curriculum. If those who make decisions are prisoners of disciplinary loyalties, our curricula will continue to remain unbalanced.

iv. Realistically, who in fact makes these decisions?

		<u>TEACHERS</u>					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
Administrators (not defined)	(51)	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	111		~~1111~~ 11
Teachers	(32)	1111	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~	111	1	~~1111~~ 11
Principals	(25)	1	11	~~1111~~ 1111	11	~~1111~~	~~1111~~ 1
School board	(18)	111	~~1111~~	~~1111~~ 1	1		111
Curriculum directors	(12)	11	111	11	1	1	111
Department heads	(12)	1	11	~~1111~~ 1		11	1
Counselors	(7)			~~1111~~		11	
Superintendents	(6)	1	111	1		1	

Other: Students (4), parents (3), government opinion (2), curriculum supervisor, District 11 (3), undefined committees (2), no answer (1).

COMMENTS

- iv. 1. Contrast with Question iii. Realistically, and in the case of the teachers often resentfully, the respondents feel that decisions are largely made by administrators. The tone of some of the responses indicated that administrators are often perceived as acting high handedly.
2. Curriculum supervisors, from their unique perspective, place a great deal of the responsibility on school principals.

- v. Do you feel that over the past 15 years the number of new courses added to and old courses dropped from the curriculum is:

		<u>TEACHERS</u>					Superintendents	Supervisors	Principals
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)			(5)	(10)	(14)
Far too great	(5)			1				1111	
Rather too great	(17)	1	1111	1111 1				111	111
About right	(47)	1111 11	1111 1	1111 1111 1111 1111	111		11		1111 1111
Not quite enough	(18)	111	1111 1	1111 1	1		1		1
Not nearly enough	(2)		11						
No answer	(7)	1111	11		1				

COMMENTS

- v. 1. Most of the answers here tended to cluster in the middle. However, note that the District 11 curriculum supervisors tend to feel that there has been too much curricular change. (Compare with Question vi.)

- vi. Do you feel that the nature of these additions and deletions over the past 15 years has been:

		<u>TEACHERS</u>					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
Far too conservative	(3)		11			1	
Rather too conservative	(17)	11	111	~~1111~~ 11	1		1111
About right	(49)	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 11	111	111	~~1111~~ 111
Rather too radical	(16)	11	11	~~1111~~ 11		111	11
Far too radical	(2)			1		1	
No answer	(9)	1111	11		1	11	

COMMENTS

- vi. 1. Again a cluster in the middle, the exception again being the curriculum supervisors who tend to see the changes as too radical.
2. Is it surprising that the younger teachers tend to group together in the middle? This may, however, be due less to reticence than to ignorance, a conclusion supported by the number of "no answer" responses to the pointed Questions ix-xii.

Further study: Analyze the quality of the changes within a particular district during the past 15 years in an attempt to help teachers and administrators understand better the conservative/radical nature of these changes. If the professional staffs are involved in the analysis this exercise should at the very least provide the participants with some stimulating discussion.

- vii. Taking into account what has transpired during the past 15 years, what general trends in course change do you favor?

		<u>TEACHERS</u>					Superintendents	Supervisors	Principals
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	(5)	(10)	(14)		
"Back-to-Basics" movement	(26)		1111	~~1111~~ 1111 1111	1	1	~~1111~~ 1		
Career-oriented courses	(26)	1	~~1111~~ 1111 1	~~1111~~ 1111	1	11	11		
Increased number of electives	(15)	111	111	~~1111~~ 1	11	1			
Student-demand courses	(14)	11	111	~~1111~~ 1	1		11		
Self-exploratory, human relations courses	(14)	11	11	111	1	11	1111		
Experimental, "hands-on" courses	(7)	1	11	11	1		1		
Remedial courses	(5)		11	11		1			

Other: No answer (3), intra-district course standardization (1), mini-courses (1), emphasis on reading (1), placement testing (1), courses for disabled (1), accelerated courses (3), independent study (4), penmanship (1), leisure skills (1), better discipline (1), inclusion of teachers in decisions (1), co-ed P.E. (1), multi-cultural approach (3), mainstreaming of handicapped (1), team teaching (1), regular curriculum revising (1), specialists teaching (1), better math/science instruction (1), consumer education (1), health education (1), behavioral sciences (1).

COMMENTS

- vii. 1. Very strong support for "back-to-basics" from the more experienced teachers and the school principals. Not one of the younger teachers supported this trend. (These responses on the part of the younger teachers seem to contradict the replies many of them made to Question viii. It isn't clear how their contradictions might be explained.)
2. The experienced teachers support career-education quite strongly.

viii. What general trends do you deplore?

RESPONSE	TEACHERS						Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
	1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)						
Softening of standards (permissiveness, neglect of "basics") (25)	11		 1			1		11	
Trendiness (19)			11					111	1
Commitment to out- moded standards (12)	1	11	111			1		111	11
No answer (10)	111	11	1			1			111
Overburdening schools with multiple responsibilities (6)			111			1		11	
Catering to the few (i.e. ethnic groups) (5)		1	11					11	

Other: Non-use of environment (1), administrative waffling (1), not enough reading (1), not enough P.E. (1), not enough composition (2), unstructured classes (3), not enough penmanship (1), bad counselling (1), new math (1), lack of continuity among courses (3), bad placing of students in electives (2), passing students on (1), "one-world" indoctrination (1), too much pressure on the very young (2), mini-courses (4), bad coordination between primary and secondary (1), large classes (2), workbooks (1), accountability (3), catering to government for funds (2), not enough history (1), not enough geography (1), not enough language (1), required courses (1), competitive sports (1), decentralization (1), "fun" learning (3).

COMMENTS

- viii. 1. "Softening of standards" and "trendiness" are wholeheartedly deplored, but it is possible that these are the prices the schools have paid in attempting to respond, on all fronts, to the "student needs" cited in Question i.
2. Consider the curriculum charts in Section II in light of the responses to this question. Can we have a system that permits teachers to teach what they wish, and students to study what they will, and avoid "trendiness"? On the other hand, consider the problems the French school system is having (and that we had in the late 60's) in trying to force students into a common mold and by resisting "trends."

ix. Specifically, what courses do you feel should not have been added to the curriculum?

		TEACHERS					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
No answer	(33)	~~1111~~ 1111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~	~~1111~~ 1111		1	1111
None	(25)	1111		~~1111~~ 1111	111	1111	~~1111~~
Special programs for special students	(6)		1	11		1	11
Other: Roberts' English (1), new math (3), co-ed P.E. (2), imaginative literature (2), environmental education (1), advanced placement (2), practical courses (3), non-basics (3), psychology (3), mini-courses (3), Southwestern literature (1), advanced languages (1), internships (1), industrial arts (1), drafting (1), astronomy (1), cycle education (1), mono-cultural courses (2), experiential education (1), advanced math (J.H.) (1), short story (1), annual (1), bi-lingual education (1), sex education (3), values clarification (2), library aides (1), sociology (1), Latin (1).							

COMMENTS: IX - XII

- ix-xii. 1. These questions are considered together because the responses were so similar.
2. The most significant aspect of these responses, one which has strong implications for the school districts involved, is the high incidence of "no answer." The respondents had opinions, often strong ones, concerning the less specifically phrased questions. However, they seem to lack definite information to back up these opinions. Furthermore, there is almost no consensus among those who did reply specifically, each respondent seeming to list a "pet hate."

Further study: Determine the full extent of teachers' and administrators' knowledge--or ignorance--of the curricular traditions within their own district. Information concerning past curricula should be based on something more solid than hearsay and rumor.

x. What courses do you feel should not have been dropped from the curriculum?

		<u>TEACHERS</u>					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
No answer	(35)	~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ 1111	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	1	111	~~1111~~
None	(25)	111	111	~~1111~~ 11	1111	111	~~1111~~

Other: Junior English (1), Senior English (1), health/physiology (4), advanced placement (1), business English (1), geometry (3), grammar (3), fine arts (3), swimming (J.H.) (1), music (J.H.) (1), Spanish (2), advanced reading (4), basic English (4), psychology (2), mathematical analysis (1), trigonometry (1), languages (4), chorus (2), speech (2), drama (2), penmanship (2), civics (1), basic math (2), remedial science (1), English classics (1).

xi. On the other hand, what courses do you feel ought to have been added to the curriculum and weren't?

RESPONSE	TEACHERS					
	1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
No answer (28)	~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ 111	1	11	1111
None (19)	1	1111	~~1111~~ 1	11	111	111
Practical/vocational (10)	11	1111	1111			
Self-exploratory (8)	11	111	1			11
Fine arts (8)	1	11	111		11	

Other: Health (2), advanced placement (1), interdisciplinary (H.S.) (1), study skills (1), outdoor education (1), swimming (Elem.) (1), logic (2), society today (1), drug/alcohol education (1), basic grammar (2), basic composition (2), remedial math (2), sociology (1), psychology (2), geometry (1), special ed: disturbed (1), computer math (1), classics (1), typing (1), dancing (1), environmental education (1), moral education (1), electronics (1), penmanship (1), elocution (1), spelling (1), reading (1), self-discipline (1), leisure activities (1), sex education (2), values (1), languages (1), statistics (1), economics (2).

xii. And which ones ought to have been dropped, and weren't?

		TEACHERS					
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
No answer	(45)	~~1111~~ 1111 1	~~1111~~ 1111 111	~~1111~~ 1111	1	1111	~~1111~~ 11
None	(21)	111	11	~~1111~~ 111	1	111	1111
Latin	(5)		1	1	11		1

Other: English electives (2), astronomy (1), meteorology (1), geometry (2), driver education (2), short story (1), annual (1), advanced languages (4), mini-courses in science (1), Colorado history (1), military history (1), competitive sports (3), bachelor survival (1), cheer leaders' seminar (1), drug education (1), sex education (1), outdoor education (1), value clarification (1).

- xiii. If the decision were entirely up to you, on what basis would you decide whether to admit a new course to the curriculum. (For example, suppose that a group of parents and students proposed a course in yoga?)

		TEACHERS						
RESPONSE		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)	
Student career needs	(49)	~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1	~~1111~~ ~~1111~~ 1111	1111	~~1111~~	~~1111~~ 1111	
Availability of qualified instructor	(26)	111	~~1111~~ 111	~~1111~~ 111	1	11	1111	
Student interest/ demand	(24)	1	~~1111~~ 111	~~1111~~ 1111		11	1111	
Cost	(22)		~~1111~~ 11	~~1111~~ 111	1		~~1111~~ 1	
Supports existing educational objectives	(19)		11	~~1111~~ 1	1	~~1111~~	~~1111~~	
Broad community support/demand	(17)	111	1111	~~1111~~	11	1	11	
No scheduling problems	(12)	1	~~1111~~	111	1	1	1	
Long-term value/ non-faddish	(11)	1	11	~~1111~~ 111				
Available facilities	(10)		1	~~1111~~ 1			111	
Can only be taught as a discrete course	(8)		11	~~1111~~		1		
Does not supplant more valuable course	(7)		111	111		1		
Does not duplicate existing course	(6)	1	11	111			1	
No answer	(5)	1	1			1	11	

Other: Increases curricular variety (2), encourages personal enrichment (4), mechanics thoroughly thought out (2), availability of follow-up courses (1), shows ability to survive pilot program (1).

COMMENTS

- xiii. 1. Student "needs" are better focused here, referring specifically to career needs.
2. "Cost" figures more importantly here than it did in Question i. One explanation for this is that in response to Question xiii respondents were invited to assume full responsibility themselves for the decision. In the process, they were forced to acknowledge that budget considerations could be compelling.

- xiv. Conversely, if the decision were up to you and you alone, on what basis would you make your judgment if a similar group of parents and students suggested dropping a time-honored course such as literature?

RESPONSE	TEACHERS					
	1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)	Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
Not satisfying student needs (undefined) (28)	1	~~1111~~ 1111	~~1111~~ 1	1111	1111	111
No student interest (15)	111	111	1111	1	11	11
No practical value in life (14)	111	1111	1111	1	11	
Doesn't support long-term educational objectives of district (10)		11	1111	1	111	
Negative cost/benefit analysis (7)		~~1111~~	1	1		
No qualified teachers (7)	1	1111			1	1
Not relevant to the times (6)		11	111		1	
No intrinsic value (5)			11		1	11
No answer (5)	11		1			11

Other: Material better taught in other courses (3), doesn't lead to further education (1), similar courses available (3), time better spent in other courses (2), school not appropriate agent (1), majority against the course (undefined) (2), no proper facilities (1), no time in schedule (1).

COMMENTS

- xiv. 1. It is supportive of the general conclusions of this study that respondents found a great deal more to say about adding courses than about dropping them. As Section II indicates, schools are ever ready to add, but avoid the hard choices involved in supplanting one course with another.

Further study: Using the role play technique, invite a number of teachers and administrators--parents and students, too, for that matter--to make some specific decisions concerning particular course additions or deletions, adopting full responsibility for their actions. This might help all concerned to come to grips with the full range of constraints which are, or ought to be, involved in any curricular decision.

- xv. Finally, how would you explain the fact that so many courses in the curriculum seem to have earned a permanent place there, with their right to be taught scarcely (in indeed ever at all) challenged? (Consider that many of the subjects in our various curricula have been there since the days of classical Greece, that is to say for over 2,000 years.)

RESPONSE		TEACHERS					Superintendents (5)	Supervisors (10)	Principals (14)
		1-3 (15)	4-6 (20)	7+ (32)					
Positive: tradition/ intrinsic value	(48)	1111	1111 1111 111	1111 1111 111		111		1111	1111 1111
Negative: inertia/ apathy/lack of creativity	(28)	1111	1111	1111 1111 111		1		1111	11
No answer	(8)	111	1	111					1
Doesn't apply to my school	(6)	11	1			1		1	1

Other: College requirements (4).

COMMENTS

- xv. 1. Answers tended to follow one of two lines: courses remain because they are part of a valuable tradition and are intrinsically worthwhile, or because the "system" is prone to inertia and unable to generate the energy or creativity necessary to reform itself.

Further study: Ask teachers to explain the value of their own discipline not in its own terms, but as it relates to all of the other disciplines and non-disciplines available to students. Inquire whether they feel that their discipline should be required of all students and why.

IV. CONCLUSION

1. We will summarize our major findings, but with this caveat: No summary can take the place of a careful reading of the tables in Sections II and III. There is a wealth of fact--and implications--in the tables to which no brief summary can do justice.

2. Section II: Course Changes.

i. Some of the most interesting information is not contained in the tables, but rather concerns the difficulty our administrative contacts had in laying hold of the data we requested, and the discrepancies that often existed between the information we received from superintendents on the one hand and principals on the other. Better coordination of records is indicated, not merely for the sake of tidy files, but because comparable information is needed in the district offices and at the building level if anything is to be done about rampant course proliferation (see #4, below).

ii. The junior highs show most growth in Humanities Practical (largely the result of the addition of many basic language courses), Artistic, and Sciences & Math Theoretical. While Social Science courses have been growing in number, they still are far behind the other academic areas. Academic and non-academic courses proliferate, the former more than the latter.

iii. In the high schools, the greatest area of growth is, as in the junior highs, Humanities Practical, followed by Artistic. Social Sciences Theoretical in third place shows considerably more growth in the high schools than in the junior highs. Also, although the number of courses in this area is not great, Self-Exploratory has increased strikingly in percentage terms since 1961. It remains to

be seen whether this will have lasting impact on the curriculum, or prove to be an educational fad. Non-academic courses show a much greater percentage increase than academic ones.

iv. It is worth noting when the periods of greatest course growth took place. For example in the high schools in district "C" and "E," the period of greatest growth has been recently, between 1970 and 1976.

3. Section III: The Questionnaires.

It would be ideal if readers were able to see the actual responses, for the quality of the answers is often as interesting as the information which the responses contain. But, to duplicate all of the individual questionnaire forms would not be practical. Among the interesting items to be gleaned from the questionnaires:

i. There is little careful defining of what is meant by "student needs," although these needs are often used as a reason for offering a particular course. "Need," we gather, can mean anything from "what it takes to get a job" to "what it takes to be an educated person," to "what I think they should study."

ii. There is general agreement that the major factors affecting the addition (or in rare cases, the dropping) of a course are teacher interest and community pressure. Cost seems to be perceived as a restraining factor. To put it another way, if a particular teacher wishes to offer a certain course and the money is available, there is a good chance that the course will materialize.

iii. There is strong support for "back-to-basics" from experienced teachers and school principals, but not from younger teachers, who tend to favor more electives, "student demand" courses and self-exploratory courses. In spite of this, younger teachers join all of the others in

deploring trendiness and what is perceived as a general softening of standards over the past 15 years.

iv. When asked for specific examples of courses rightly and wrongly added or dropped, all categories were found wanting in information. At least, this is the most plausible reason for the large number of "no answer" to questions ix-xii.

4. These next conclusions are bound to be controversial, partly because some of the data supporting these contentions is circumstantial and partly because what will now be said may challenge many of the values of teachers and administrators alike. Understand that the statements that follow are intended not to be dogmatic, but to encourage debate in a matter that we feel should no longer be ignored:

The relative growth of the different academic and non-academic courses is interesting, but even more significant is the evidence that courses are multiplying alarmingly and that the education available to students is markedly more diffuse than it was fifteen years ago. In some ways this phenomenon is a healthy one and gives evidence of a flexibility in our system which is lacking in many European countries. Certainly one cannot imagine our students rioting, as they have in France, because education is the hidebound prisoner of tradition. However, having stated what is positive about proliferation, we must conclude that the overall picture is a distressing one and calls for correction. The serious question must be asked: Where does it all stop?

A related question might be: What do we believe all students should share in common? If the answer is "very little," then we may continue along our present lines. With continued proliferation the number of courses will,

in time, more and more closely approximate the number of students (or, more to the point, the number of teachers) so that in the not-too-distant future it may be possible that very few graduates will have taken the same "program." In asking graduates to sum up what their education has meant to them, their accounts will increasingly parallel the fable of the seven blind men and the elephant.

To state it another way, our curricula seem to have become sacrifices to the "do-your-own-thing" philosophy. In catering to individual desires (which may often be no more than whims) we have neglected social needs. It is perhaps time for the schools to focus less upon the student's need to differentiate him- or herself from the rest of society by means of a mass of special programs and electives and to concentrate upon developing whatever it is that holds us together. Toward this end, we need to create more coherent curricula.

If we are interested in arresting the trend toward unregulated course proliferation, it might be useful to consider how the process developed in the first place. A dramatic way of stating the case and one which will, no doubt, have its advocates, is to say that the situation is the product of willful teachers, students, and special interest groups on one side, and acquiescent administrators on the other. This does not really define the problem, however. There is a subtler, although less dramatic, way of analyzing the phenomenon of proliferation which to us is more satisfying, although slightly paradoxical. This explanation assumes that because of an understandable, and even praiseworthy, pursuit of private ends, larger considerations are often neglected.

To be more specific, it has been stated by many of those with whom we have discussed this study that the disciplines themselves are showing signs of great vitality.

One obvious example is found in the teaching of biology, which has undergone radical changes since the 1950's. Mathematics, literature, the social sciences, virtually all subject areas are constantly being analyzed, sifted and refined. It is, of course, essential that teachers be involved in their discipline and promote its interests. However, to say that a curriculum ought to be the product of all of these interests and nothing more is like saying that in order to build a beautiful house one need only hire the best carpenters, plumbers, and electricians and give them free rein. The result, of course would be the structural equivalent of many of our present curricula. To conclude the metaphor, our curricula (which are less and less curricula in the true sense of the word and more and more mere collections of courses) seem badly to need the services of an architect. Granted, there are principals, superintendents, department heads and various kinds of committees presumably evaluating the many proposals for new courses. In making their decisions, however, those responsible seem not to consider as a major criterion the extent to which any proposed course supports or modifies the existing curriculum, that is to say the degree to which a new course affects curricular balance. The operative word is "alternatives." If a course provides students with an alternative then it is allowable. But what will happen to a school system, or for that matter to the society of which it is a part, when it provides nothing but alternatives?

The answer, we suggest, does not lie in a return to lock-step educational patterns. It was in response to those that our current situation has evolved. Nevertheless, it is time that we recognized the futility of simply adding a course to respond to every expressed or imagined desire, from whatever direction it may come.

Although there is no easy formula, we feel compelled to suggest some guidelines for concerned teachers and administrators who may be interested in arresting the trend toward proliferation:

i. Determine whether this situation exists in your district or school.

ii. If it does, admit no new courses unless it can be shown that they support the school system's basic educational objectives. Allowances must be made, of course, for certain differences among the varied constituencies of any complex school system, but in attempting to solve a local educational problem, avoid the habit of simply adding a new course as the first line of defense.

iii. Before #2 can be put into effect, the system must actually have "basic educational objectives." These must be stated in reasonably specific terms ("ability to quantify," "comprehensive knowledge of Western literary tradition") and not so generally as to be totally vacuous ("responsiveness to the needs of the students").

iv. Charge an individual or a committee with the responsibility of orchestrating the curriculum so that it meets these objectives. It is essential that the individuals so charged be committed to the principle of curricular balance and not be the prisoners of a single discipline. It would be most desirable if a method could be found, however, to transfer the model of disciplinary growth (vital, well-focused, assured) to the curriculum in general (distracted, diffuse, insecure).

v. Make choices: In the future, drop a course when one is added. Continually prune the existing list, exercising judgment and concern. "Balance" is the goal and that means avoiding both rigidity and permissiveness.

vi. While bringing the number of electives within reasonable bounds, consider what required courses might be established in order to give all students a shared experience.

Should the schools try to respond to every personal and social "need," by adding courses indefinitely to an already overburdened curriculum? When C. Northcote Parkinson announced his "Third Law" some fifteen years ago, he had business corporations in mind. The law is applicable to our schools, too. It states: "Expansion means complexity, and complexity, decay." We must seriously consider what will happen if, by means of course proliferation, the schools continue to attempt to satisfy all of the individual needs of the students and teachers alike. We run the risk of developing curricula that are, on the surface, varied and exciting, but which add up to nothing. We may create the ultimate paradox: A supremely individualized curriculum which, in the end, does nothing for the individual.